

SPIROGLYPHUS DAUDIN, 1800 AND *STOA* DE SERRES, 1855
(MOLLUSCA, GASTROPODA, VERMETIDAE): PROPOSED
SUPPRESSION OF TWO EQUIVOCAL GENERIC
NAMES.Z.N.(S.)2340

By A. Myra Keen (*Department of Geology, Stanford University, California 94305, U.S.A.*) and Michael G. Hadfield (*Kewalo Marine Laboratory, Pacific Biomedical Research Center, University of Hawaii, 41 Ahui Street, Honolulu, Hawaii 96813, U.S.A.*, to whom any enquiries or requests for offprints should be addressed)

This application seeks suppression of two nominal genera based on species not now adequately interpretable. The first is *Spiroglyphus* Daudin, 1800 (p. 39). Two species were described under it, *S. politus* (p. 49) and *S. annulatus* (p. 50, figs 28–29). Daudin considered both to be tubicolous annelids corroding a channel on other shells. He figured only one. Both were said to come from the Indian Ocean, the figured form entrenched on a fissurellid gastropod (a keyhole limpet). He had not seen living animals. Gray, 1840, cited *Spiroglyphus* as molluscan — a genus of marine snails. He allocated it to the family VERMETIDAE based on *Vermetus* which Cuvier, 1800, table 5, had also described and correctly considered a gastropod.

2. *Vermetus* was published twice in 1800: first by Cuvier: *Leçons anat. comp.* vol. 1, table 5; the date of this is taken from *J. typ. bibl.* year 3, p. 218, 30 Germinal an 8 [= 19 April, 1800], and the second by Daudin: *Recueil de mémoires et de notes sur des espèces inédites ou peu connues de Mollusques, de Vers, et de Zoophytes*, p. 34; the date of this is taken from *J. typ. bibl.* year 4, p. 43, 15 Brumaire an 9 [= 5 November, 1800].

3. Mörch, principal reviser of the VERMETIDAE in the 19th century, selecting in 1861 the figured form as type species, reinterpreted its type locality and identified it as the sole entrenching vermetid of the Caribbean area. Actually, at least three such are known there now. Moreover, there are keyhole limpets in the Indo-Pacific that match Daudin's figure well, and vermetids of both Caribbean and Indo-Pacific areas have entrenching species.

4. Faced with questions about the type locality and the morphology of the type species and having discovered that annelid specialists were likewise uncertain about Daudin's figure, one of us (Keen, 1961) suggested that the name *Spiroglyphus* should be set aside and regarded as a *genus dubium* until such time as type material could be recovered or a suitable neotype lot be selected. In the twenty years since this judgement was published, search has not revealed either Daudin's original material or a plausible specimen for replacement. Meanwhile the alternative name *Dendropoma* Mörch, 1861 (p. 153) (which then seemed preferable because it was based on extant type material in the British Museum (Natural History)), has gained currency not only among malacologists but also among ecologists and earth scientists, who are realising the usefulness of these mollusks as precise indicators of intertidal levels and hence of any shoreline changes.

5. The second generic name, *Stoa* De Serres, 1855 (p. 238) was also described as applying to tubicolous annelids that were 'perforating', i.e. entrenching. De Serres named three species but did not select any one as type species, nor has a selection been made since. He said the animals corroded channels, especially in bivalves, and that the operculum, which was intact in one specimen, was steeply conic, solid and calcareous. He commented on its lack of a pedicel or stalk such as other serpulid genera exhibited and assumed it might have broken off. If his figure was accurate, the operculum is unlike that of any known vermetid, with a marked notch on the outer margin. Mörch, 1861–1862, who dismissed *Stoa* as a synonym of two earlier names (*Spiroglyphus* Daudin, 1800 and *Siphonium* Gray, 1850) was unable to recognise any of De Serres' three species among the abundant vermetid material in European museums that he studied. His treatment of the taxon, however, was ambiguous. After synonymizing it and without defining *Stoa* as a separate unit, he cited the name subgenerically for six species, under '*Siphonium*' (actually an invalid name, pre-occupied by *Siphonium* Link, 1807). He reprinted De Serres' descriptions but cited only one under the subgenus *Stoa*, the other two being considered *Spiroglyphus* by him. Subsequently, *Stoa* was cited in molluscan literature only as a synonym until 1939, when J. R. le B. Tomlin used it subgenerically for a new vermetid, again without designating the type species or supplying a diagnosis. It has not been used since.

6. De Serres stated that his specimens of *Stoa* were in the collections of the Université de Montpellier, but inquiry there has not produced any information about them. They can thus be presumed to be lost. If the operculum was as described — calcareous, steeply conic and solid — one can doubt that *Stoa* was based on molluscan material. Moreover, Fauchald, 1977, in a compilation of generic names of annelid polychaetes, lists *Stoa* under the family SPIROBIDAE, classing it as 'invalid' and 'indeterminable'.

7. Suppression of these two names would at present seem to have no adverse effect on nomenclatural stability. No family-group names are involved. *Spiroglyphus* as a generic name in the Mollusca has appeared in only one major faunal work in the last twenty years, and the author of that work now plans (personal communication) to adopt *Dendropoma* in future editions. Meanwhile, more than a dozen journal articles have been published, by various authors, in which the name *Dendropoma* appears either in the title or the abstract. *Dendropoma* has also been used, in preference to *Spiroglyphus*, in at least four major faunal works. The late Dr Olga Hartman, a specialist on polychaete annelids, included *Spiroglyphus* in her 1959 list of possible genera (p. 47), but she regarded it as 'doubtful' (personal communication). Fauchald, 1977, did not list the name. Although *Spiroglyphus* was used by Californian palaeontologists for certain fossil annelids, this is generally conceded now to have been misidentification. The name *Stoa*, except for the ambiguous and inconsistent citation of Mörch in 1861, was used in Mollusca only once since its proposal in 1855, and then

only as an undefined subgenus. Although of doubtful status, the unit is not completely rejected by annelid specialists. It would seem, then, that suppression would not cause problems in either field. Of the two names, only *Spiroglyphus* gained any status, when it was cited in Mollusca by various authors between—roughly—1860 and 1960. Reviving it now involves morphologic problems and, because it has priority, would require taxonomic readjustments in the classification of the family. The recommended replacement, *Dendropoma*, is based upon extant type material from known provenance, readily interpretable.

8. A number of malacologists who have been consulted on this proposed petition have offered no dissent. Their attitude seems to be that achieving stability by suppressing the names *Spiroglyphus* and *Stoa* would be preferable to trying to validate them, then having to readjust a classification that is coming into acceptance.

9. Therefore, the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, in the interests of current usage and nomenclatural stability, is asked:

- (1) to use its plenary powers to suppress for the purposes of the Principle of Priority but not for those of the Principle of Homonymy.
 - (a) the generic name *Spiroglyphus* Daudin, 1800, as being based upon unidentifiable material; and to place the name on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology;
 - (b) the generic name *Stoa* De Serres, 1855, as being based upon unidentifiable material; and to place the name on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology;
 - (c) the specific names *annulatus* and *politus*, as published in the binomina *Spiroglyphus annulatus* and *S. politus* Daudin, 1800, and to place them on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology;
 - (d) the specific names *perforans* (p. 241), *ammonitiformis* (p. 240) and *spirulaeformis* (p. 241) as published in the binomina *Stoa perforans*, *S. ammonitiformis* and *S. spirulaeformis* De Serres, 1855, and to place them on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology;
- (2) to place the generic name *Dendropoma* Mörch, 1861 (gender: neuter), type species, by designation of Keen, 1961, *Siphonium* (*D.*) *lituellum* Mörch, 1861 (p. 154), on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology;
- (3) to place the specific name *lituellum* Mörch, 1861 as proposed in the binomen *Siphonium* (*Dendropoma*) *lituella* (specific name of type species of *Dendropoma* Mörch, 1861) on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology.

REFERENCES

- DAUDIN, F. M. 1800. *Recueil de mémoires et de notes sur des espèces inédites ou peu connues de Mollusques, de Vers, et de Zoophytes*. Paris, privately printed, pp. 1-50, 4 pls.
- DE SERRES, M. 1855. Notes sur un nouveau genre d'annélide tubicole perforant. *Ann. Sci. nat., Paris, Zool.*, ser. 4, vol. 4, pp. 238-243, 1 pl.
- FAUCHALD, K. 1977. The polychaete worms: definitions and keys to the orders, families, and genera. *Los Angeles County Natural History Museum, Science Ser.*, no. 28, 188 pp., 42 figs.
- GRAY, J. E. 1840. *Synopsis of the Contents of the British Museum*. London, 42nd ed. p. 118.
- HARTMAN, O. 1959. Catalogue of polychaetous annelids of the world. *Allan Hancock Foundation Occasional Paper* No. 23, pt. 1, p. 47.
- KEEN, A. M. 1961. A proposed reclassification of the gastropod family Vermetidae. *Bull. British Mus. (Nat. Hist.)*, vol. 7, no. 3, pp. 183-212, 2 pls.
- MÖRCH, O. A. L. 1861-1862. Review of the Vermetidae. Part I. *Proc. Zool. Soc. London* for 1861, no. 2, pp. 145-181, Sept., 1861; Part II, *ibid*, no. 3, pp. 326-365, pl. 25, Apr., 1862; Part III, *ibid*, for 1862, no. 1, pp. 54-83, June, 1862.